

portant object; and as indicating the existence of that fountain of human sympathy to which we look for aid in the great cause of freedom, and as an instance of fidelity to their highest convictions in the managers of the institution, we rejoice heartily in their success, wishing them the additional and deeper satisfaction of sharing with us in the deliverance of our whole country from dishonor, and our compatriots from wrong and slavery. This ought they to do, and not to leave the other undone.

A second, and ever to be deprecated obstacle, lay in the aptitude of men and women to see some easy and self-indulgent way to gratify the natural sympathy for suffering; some mode by which they could delude themselves into the belief that they were relieving it without pain to themselves; as the boy claimed to be sharpening the axe while he turned the wheel without pressure of the instrument upon the grindstone. This is an exact illustration of the Liberty party instrumentality, and mode of operation, in its best, i. e. its abstract aspect; and the delusion ever operates disastrously on the cause; while the effect of the Liberty party, in the concrete, is to dishonor by its baseness, the very name of Anti-Slavery, and to endeavor, whenever a cent may be made by the mistake, to pass itself off as identical with Anti-Slavery.

From the first hour of the secession of the leaders of the Liberty party from the Anti-Slavery movement, we have been most solicitous to do nothing which should give to the public the idea, then so much deprecated by them, that there was the smallest affinity between them and the American Society, and its auxiliaries; and previous to the opening of the Fair, we gave notice, in unequivocal terms, of the fact of the entire discrepancy between the Liberty party and the Anti-Slavery movement, of which we are the promoters. In giving this notice, we are careful to give the Liberty party and the New Organization, the names of their own choice. The action on its part was as follows:

"We are requested to state that the Fair now in operation at the Marlboro' Hall, Washington street, has no connection with the anti-slavery, no government, woman's rights Fair, which is to be held some time during the present year."—*Boston Morning Post.*

The action is the opposition forced out, the perfect exponent, in all its horrible and malevolent falsehood, of the Liberty party spirit of enmity to our cause. It labors throughout the year—at home and abroad—in city and country—but more in private than in public—to deprive the Anti-Slavery agents of places of meeting—to hinder the people from listening to the truth that might save the nation from destruction—and by every possible device of calumny and fraud, to divert funds and sympathy from our operations.

We occasionally receive letters like the following in effect:—"We send you our little contribution for the Fair, with heartiest good-will. We anticipated sending you something of more value, for at our first gathering we were a large number; but, before we had time to act, the Liberty party and the pro-slavery clergy united in a popular clamor of 'infidelity,' &c. and produced the effect they desired, in quenching the sympathy which was kindling for the cause in this place."

Between the ill effects wrought by the evil members of this party, in connection with the most hopelessly pro-slavery classes of the community, in awakening an indiscriminating suspicion of the very name of Anti-Slavery, which they have abused with such shameless hypocrisy, it is felt by all the hearty and disinterested members of the Anti-slavery cause, (and for the most part, in exact proportion to their interest and activity do they feel it) that the cause has at this moment no obstacle to contend with so deadly as that paralysis of the moral sense induced by action with the Liberty Party.

When, in view of all obstacles, the cause, as measured by the success of the Fair, is found to have made so much progress since last year, it affords cause of warm congratulation, and gives us the assurance that all such obstacles must go down before the onset of victorious truth.

The Fair closed with a joyful and animated gathering from various parts of the country and the State; though a feeling of sympathy in the bereavement of our friends, the Hutchinsons, somewhat changed the festive character we had thought to give to the entertainment. The noble speeches of Messrs. Phillips, Douglass, and Garrison, will be given hereafter, as time permits us to write them out.

There has been in past years, (even after the first well-conducted Fairs held in Boston,) a prejudice in many minds against this mode of aiding any good purpose. It was a justly founded prejudice, occasioned by the mismanagement of many such undertakings. We are happy to find that the excellent order, the judicious arrangements, the rigid economy, the exact accounts, the diligent attention to business, the admirable propriety of manner, and the true devotedness of soul, always observable at the MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR, have completely vindicated this instrumentality in the prosecution of our enterprise. We are solicitous to have all our measures worthy of our principles—all our means worthy of our end; and we acknowledge much incidental benefit in the increased capacities of heart and mind which the incidents and efforts of the Fairs have given us. We thought to win freedom for the slave. We have seen a progress towards it beyond our most sanguine hopes, and have won beside what we did not think of—freedom of action for ourselves, unutterable satisfaction to the moral nature, with culture and gratification to the imagination, the invention, and the taste. "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

We have already re-organized our efforts for the promulgation of our anti-slavery principles through the means of the Fair of 1845, and ask general co-operation for the sake of our cause, our country, and the world.

M. W. C.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

Of money received in 1844 for the Liberty Bell and the good purpose of the Eleventh Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Fair.

Charlotte Austin,	\$5 00
Friends in Hubbardston, by Clara Swan,	4 00
Charlotte Cones,	5 00
Catherine Sargent,	5 00
George R. Russell,	5 00
Wendell Phillips,	5 00
Nathaniel Johnson,	5 00
Edmund Jackson,	27 00
Mary G. Chapman,	5 00
Collected by F. H. Drake, received at different times,	5 50
Mrs. George Mills,	5 00
Princeton Anti-Slavery sewing circle,	3 00
Mrs. F. G. Shaw,	5 00
Anna Quincy Thaxter,	5 00
Miss Edman,	1 00
New Bedford A. S. Society, by W. Phillips,	5 00
Misses Cushing,	2 00
Samuel G. Howe,	10 00
Henrietta Sargent,	5 00
Mrs. Ellis Gray Loring,	10 00
Paulina S. Wright,	3 00
Samuel Lightbody,	3 00
Hannah Barnard & C. Carter,	5 00
Mrs. Farrar,	3 00
Daniel P. Parker,	10 00
Harriet Sturges,	2 00
Eunice Dorman,	2 00
Louy Gates,	1 00
Dolly Thomas,	1 00
Mrs. Henry Mansfield,	1 00
From friends in Westminster,	4 00
Richard Clapp,	5 00
Hingham friends,	14 00
M. A. Bishop,	1 00
Oliver H. Tucker,	1 00
Miss Wallace,	50
Ladies of Leicester,	1 75
Elvira Kimball,	1 12
West Brookfield, by Mrs. Gilbert,	13 25
Athol, by Mrs. Hoyt,	5 50

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.

NOTE.—In the list of towns which made donations to the Fair, the name of Dedham was accidentally omitted.

COUNTER ANNEXATION.

A petition is in circulation, in Detroit, Michigan, for the Annexation of Canada. The petitioners pray that negotiations may be opened for the cession of Canada and that in any proceeding for the Annexation of Texas, a provision be inserted that it shall not take place till Can-

ada can also be annexed. The reasons set forth are, first, that the addition to the South of Texas would require the addition of Canada to the North in order to maintain the just balance of the Union; and secondly, that the acquisition of Canada is, in itself, a desirable acquisition for the United States. What will become of the slaves if we extend the area of Freedom northward also? God grant that no more soil may be cursed with such Republicanism as we have.

Mr. John Jay and the Emancipator.

The Standard of January 9th contains a letter from Mr. John Jay, in reply to my remarks upon his letter touching the Emancipator, contained in the Standard of October 3d. Mr. Jay complains that I had recourse to that article to "pervert language, and defame of character." I hardly need deny having had any such intention. Mr. Jay knows that I have no reason to entertain, and I know that I do entertain, no feelings towards him, personally, other than the friendliest character. I still think that the language used by him in his first letter justified the inference I made from it, though of course his present statement will be received as an explanation of how he meant it to be understood. Mr. Jay's complaint is, that I stated that the ground on which he rested the defence of the City Society was, that "if," according to the doctrine of the American Society, "the American Board had no right to transfer the Emancipator to the City Board, without the consent of the American Society, then the City Board, being in possession (whether honestly or fraudulently,) had no right to re-transfer without the consent of the City Society." This inference, "whether honestly or fraudulently," he thinks "was not authorized by a single word or syllable in his letter." I will quote the passages of his letter from which I deduced it. Mr. Jay says in that letter:

"During their sittings, (the American Society's,) in New-York, in May, 1840, I was waited upon at my office by a Committee of gentlemen, consisting of Ellis Gray Loring, Esq. of Boston, Mr. Earle, of Philadelphia, and others," at whose request a meeting of the City Board was convened.

"These gentlemen plainly intimated to the Board their belief, that the Executive Committee had acted fraudulently in transferring the Emancipator, and that the City Society had become parties to the fraud by accepting the transfer. They urged upon the Board, and supported the position, that without their consent, they said that it was not right to do so without the sanction of the body to which it actually belonged; and they, therefore, asked its re-transfer, on the ground that the Society had in its corporate capacity, disapproved of the act, and demanded that it should be annulled."

"As far as my recollection serves me, the Managers briefly but strongly expressed their conviction of the integrity of the gentlemen by whom the transfer to them had been made, and after noticing the arguments on which the re-transfer was demanded, to wit: that when the Emancipator became the property of the Committee, it became the property of the Society, and could not be disposed of without their consent, they said that it was not right to do so without the sanction of the body to which it actually belonged; and they, therefore, asked its re-transfer, on the ground that the Society had in its corporate capacity, disapproved of the act, and demanded that it should be annulled."

Mr. Jay intimates that if these gentlemen "had presented to us, not vague suspicions merely, but satisfactory proof, that a fraud had been perpetrated," and then the City Society had retained its possession, my language would have been justifiable. I was not upon that Committee, and consequently cannot state whether the proof was adduced or not; but, if not, it must have been because the facts upon which Messrs. Loring and Earle rested their "strong legal arguments," were not denied. For the proof was at hand, and could have been produced, in the handwriting of the transferring Board, if it had been demanded. And as far as weight of opinion went, that of counsel learned in the law, like Messrs. Loring and Earle, might at least be supposed to counterbalance that of Messrs. Tappan, Leavitt, &c., as to the character of a business transaction.

When, therefore, the City Board said that the paper had legally become the property of the City Society, (these facts, being, as I supposed, admitted,) and that on the principles of the American Society itself, it would not be restored by the Board without the consent of the City Society, my inference that they regarded their possession as good in law, whether "honestly or fraudulently" obtained, was a natural, if not a necessary one. At any rate, it seemed the inevitable one, not only to me, and to those of my way of thinking, but to impartial persons, entirely disconnected with the Anti-Slavery movement. The whole grammar of the matter lay in the fraudulent character of the transaction. If the American Board had acted honestly in the transfer, the City Board had no occasion to resort to any such circular mode of reasoning, to justify its refusal to re-transfer. It was their own to do what they would with it. Their reply would be substantially, in the civiliest of language, of course, "Gentlemen, it is none of your business. The paper is honestly ours, and we shall do what we like with it." I certainly did not suppose that Mr. Jay, after listening to the "strong legal arguments" of eminent lawyers, founded upon a statement of facts, which, if not verified by evidence, it was only because it was not called for, would assume the very point at issue, and rest the title of the Society to the paper, upon the honesty of the original transfer. I supposed, and so did others, that he admitted the substantial truth of the statements and arguments of the conferring Committee, but still held that the paper having come into the possession of the Society by the action of the Board, could not be parted with, without recurrence to the Society. This certainly seemed to be the doctrine of a very young lawyer, but it appeared to be the natural meaning of Mr. Jay's language. He has now disclaimed such meaning, and he is entitled to the benefit of the disclaimer.

Mr. Jay expresses, in the course of his letter, the true secret of his concurrence in this transaction. It was his unquestioning reliance upon the men composing the American Committee, and his readiness to believe, without inquiry, that whatever they did was necessarily right. This I had always believed to have been the fact. I never thought Mr. Jay capable of consenting to what he believed to be a dishonest or unbecoming transaction. His misfortune was in placing his confidence in men who did not deserve it. His fault will be, if he endeavors to make their wrong appear a right, because he was unfortunately mixed up with it. I do not believe that Mr. Jay meant to do a dishonest action in receiving the Emancipator, any more than I do that he deliberately told the calumnious falsehoods contained in his Address, put forth on the eve of that meeting. He acted in both cases as the mouthpiece and instrument of men whom he did not believe could lie or cheat. He was to blame in both instances, but in a very different measure from his principals. He can place himself in the same category with them if he choose, but I have never placed him there, and should deeply lament to see him put himself in such a predicament.

There was nothing in all the meanness and the wickedness of that unhappy time, that more deeply stirred my indignation, than the manner in which that Committee involved Mr. Jay in this transaction. It was no common act of turpitude for men of mature life and long experience, to make use of the illustrious and venerable name, a name which I was always taught to regard as the second, and which I have since learned to consider as the first, in our history,—of a young man, scarcely arrived at majority, as a cover for their base and treacherous betrayal of the cause entrusted to their hands. It was no small aggravation of their guilt, to mislead the unlimited confidence of such a young man in them, to implicate him in a false transaction, which, from its very nature, can never be forgotten, the odor of which will adhere to him to the end of the longest life. It was very, very base. They knew perfectly well what they were about. They, no doubt, supposed they would be able to smother

up the affair, and prevent public scandal, as they had known such things to be managed in the churches. They showed that they did not understand either the nature of the cause they were betraying, or the character of the men with whom they had to deal. But this in no degree diminishes their culpability, either towards the slave, or towards Mr. Jay. I apprehend that there is no one who is not desirous that every allowance should be made, which Mr. Jay will suffer to be made for this error of his youth. Many, and friendly eyes are fixed upon his course, in the hope and belief that it will be worthy of the great name he bears,—a name synonymous with devotion to Liberty, with personal honor, with private excellence, and with public virtue.—

Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

It is impossible in this week's Standard to give anything like a detailed account of this meeting. Like all those held in Boston, it was a very full one, and like all Boston Anti-Slavery meetings, it was, of course, also a good one. Recent events gave it an uncommon interest, not only among the members of the Society, but with those who are not, and do not desire to be ranked among Abolitionists. It was marked, not only by the most uncompromising spirit, and the most earnest tone, but by a deep and thoughtful, and quiet interest, in the thousands in attendance, in the great truths which were uttered, which shows that the principles of our glorious cause are taking a strong hold upon the popular mind. The last session was held, as usual, in the State House, and the stirring appeals of Garrison, and the masterly eloquence of Phillips, were listened to there, as they denounced the existing union with slaveholders, with breathless silence, by the multitude, broken only by the bursts of applause which greeted the utmost stretch of their "fanaticism." A spirit is awakened in the Old Bay State, at which the tyrants, both North and South, may well tremble.

There was more than usual harmony. Even that "flea of Conventions," Abigail Polson, failed to distract attention from the object of the meeting. The people came to listen and to learn, and not to be amused. Once it was found necessary to remove her, but excepting the slight disturbance which this occasioned for the moment, it had no other effect. Nobody protested, and nobody, of course, found it necessary to defend an act, the propriety of which was so apparent. The time has passed when the people rejoice at any and every obstacle which can be thrown in our way. They begin to learn that this is a matter in which their dearest rights and interests are involved. But a full account will appear in the next paper of this occasion, which has filled all hearts with gladness, and strengthened our hopes almost into certainty that the end we seek is almost gained. It needs only to arouse the people to their own, and the slaves' wrongs, and the speedy overthrow of Slavery is certain. The people are aroused.

Whipping-in.

The Richmond Enquirer takes very plainly to the faithful, and warns them of the consequences of being faithful. There will be no pap for those who are not ready to do the bidding of the slave-mongers. The Boston Post, the leading Democratic paper of Massachusetts, has gained a new impulse within a week past, perhaps from this very paragraph, and forbids the brethren there from committing so wicked an act as attending the Anti-Texas Convention, which was held, probably, yesterday, in Faneuil Hall. The Morning News of this city, has always been faithful, but the Evening Post won't be whipped in. The following is the paragraph from the Enquirer:

"We rejoice that those deserting Democrats, who oppose this vital question, which Mr. Polk so anxiously desires to be settled at this session, will HAVE NOTHING TO EXPECT FROM HIS ADMINISTRATION. Those Northern Democrats who avail themselves of this critical contest with our great transatlantic rival, to indulge their fanatical hatred of the South, will find themselves mistaken in their calculations,—marked by a great and sudden disaster, and we dare to say, that if they should defeat us, we shall have, at least, the consolation of knowing that they will be, hereafter, defeated in their own aspirations."

Mr. Hubbard.

The Governor of Louisiana, thus concludes his Message transmitting Mr. Hubbard's letters to the Legislature: "In connection with this subject, I have thought it not amiss to transmit for your consideration, two letters from a person claiming to be the agent for this city, under the signature of 'J. H. Hubbard,' and who has been endeavoring to get his letters to be deemed worthy of your notice, not with any design to give credit to his mission; but that they may possibly indicate the expediency of such further legislation, as may guard the State in future, from the intrusion of any such emissary. A. MOUTON.

MEXICO.—Later intelligence from Mexico has been received, by which it appears that the rumor of the defeat of Santa Anna by Paredes, is unfounded. Santa Anna has under his command an army of twelve thousand men.

From our Washington Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 25, 1845. The defaulting Clerk has been held to bail in the sum of \$45,000. I understand his political friends at a distance have sent in, already, the sum of \$50,000 towards making up the deficiency.

On Monday, the 20th, the Texas question begins to look very sectional. The Committee was addressed by Mr. Hammett, of Mississippi, whose speech amounted to Texas-re-annexation—re-annexation—disunion.

Mr. Hudson made a most argumentative disquisition on Anti-Slavery exposure. He was followed by little Marsh, of Vermont, who came thundering down on the South severely. He was followed by that strong Southern man, Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, in his most able style, in a speech on the constitutionality and expediency of Annexation. Under the former head, the ingenuity of an able lawyer, was vainly displayed, and under the latter, the eloquence of an expert beggar was patriotically arrayed.

Mr. Giddings made one of his plain anti-slavery speeches, in which he said he had been expelled from the House for introducing the subject of Slavery into it, and now that it was agitated by Southern men, he hoped he would be permitted to express his views, and he was not about to propose that they should be expelled. Mr. G. spoke of the lash, of chains, and Slavery; cited awful scenes which have occurred in the city under his eye, spoke of the little here, from whence ascends daily, the clank of chains, and the groans of a downtrodden race. And, asked Mr. G., "Will Annexation put an end to all this?"

Each speech occupies an hour, to which they are limited. The House meets now at 11, and the debate on Texas is to end on Saturday, the 25th, at 2 o'clock. When a speaker concludes, some thirty members spring to the floor at the fall of the Chairman's hammer. It is indeed interesting to attend the debate, to see the spirit with which it is conducted, and to see them take new tracks. I will keep this letter open until its fate is decided.

Mr. Rathbun, a Democrat, from New-York, next addressed the Committee against Texas, Slavery, and the assumption by the House, of powers not delegated to them, as well as against setting themselves up as a court of appeals, to reverse the decision of the Senate, to whom, and the President alone, belonged the treaty-making power. And this would be a treaty to all intents and purposes. He was out upon the whole scheme. Southern men had said here, that the Governor of New-York was trembling on his throne, in view of his vote against Annexation in the Senate. Let him say to them that Mr. Wright stands too high for their meagre arrows. He is deeply seated in the hearts of his countrymen, and he is elected Governor by an anti-Texas vote of ten thousand majority. If the Texas question had been before the people of New-York, in the last election, it could not have mustered a corporal's guard. "Wright is never wrong."

A fierce debate sprung up to day, in the morning hour. Mr. Robinson, of New-York, introduced a bill for the Annexation of Texas, free free. A motion was immediately made to reject the bill. They were thrown into confusion, but finally the bill was received and referred to the Committee of the Whole, as the rest had been. But it gave opportunity for some of the opponents of

sanction or undertake the illegal liberation of slaves; and I feel bound, by my allegiance to the State of Kentucky, to resist that force, if necessary, by all such efforts. While I hold that the United States Constitution has no power to establish Slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories, or in any place of its exclusive supremacy; so I contend, that in the States, once admitted into the Union, and thereby become sovereign and independent, Congress has no power or right to interfere with, or touch Slavery, without the legitimate consent of the States.

I believe that the addition of new slave States, or slave territory, to this Union, is unconstitutional and I am the avowed and uncompromising enemy of Slavery, and shall never cease to use all constitutional, and honorable, and just means, to cause its extinction in Kentucky, and to its reclusion to its constitutional limits of the States.

Both a Kentuckian, and a slaveholder, I have no prejudices nor enmities to gratify; but, impelled by a sense of self-respect, love and justice, and the highest expediency, I shall ever maintain that liberty is our only safety. For the freedom of speech, and of the press, I never shall cease to battle with life and death. I have no Kentucky so base as to yield these constitutional and glorious privileges, without which it is the vilest mockery to talk of being a free people. I envy him not: A slave to slaves, let him sicken in his infamy. With such I hold no fellowship—from such I ask no quarter. All I ask is an open field and a fair fight.

Your obedient servant, C. M. CLAY.

Frankfort, Ky. Jan. 8, 1845.

Capt. Ricketson.

This man, who returned the fugitive who had taken refuge on board his vessel, is meeting with the execration his infamous conduct so richly merits. Pro-slavery as Massachusetts is, there are few who will uphold so meanly wicked an act as this. The following letter appears in the last Liberator. The writer is a son of the late Joseph Ricketson, one of the earliest advocates of the Anti-Slavery cause. The noble testimony of the son, is worthy the character of the father.

TO THE PUBLIC.

As the conduct of Capt. Gilbert Ricketson, of the schooner Cornelia, of this port, in returning a slave who had secreted himself on board said vessel, which also resulted in the imprisonment of a free colored man, a citizen of New Bedford, has caused considerable, and unjust prejudice on the part of many, I am desirous, as an owner of said vessel, as far as my own interest is concerned, to say, that I had much rather it would have been jeopardized, or even lost forever, than such an act, in which I might in any wise have been connected, should have occurred.

I have been laboring under a fit of sickness for some time, &c. I should have made my views public before.

JOSEPH RICKETSON.

New Bedford, 1 m. 17th, 1845.

At a public meeting held in New Bedford, the following resolution was offered by John Bailey, and unanimously passed:

"That the disclaimer of Joseph Ricketson, son of our lamented townsman, Joseph Ricketson, and one of the owners of the schooner Cornelia, proves him to be a worthy son of a noble sire, and meets our warmest approbation, and merits the thanks of this meeting."

Whipping-in.

The Richmond Enquirer takes very plainly to the faithful, and warns them of the consequences of being faithful. There will be no pap for those who are not ready to do the bidding of the slave-mongers. The Boston Post, the leading Democratic paper of Massachusetts, has gained a new impulse within a week past, perhaps from this very paragraph, and forbids the brethren there from committing so wicked an act as attending the Anti-Texas Convention, which was held, probably, yesterday, in Faneuil Hall. The Morning News of this city, has always been faithful, but the Evening Post won't be whipped in. The following is the paragraph from the Enquirer:

"We rejoice that those deserting Democrats, who oppose this vital question, which Mr. Polk so anxiously desires to be settled at this session, will HAVE NOTHING TO EXPECT FROM HIS ADMINISTRATION. Those Northern Democrats who avail themselves of this critical contest with our great transatlantic rival, to indulge their fanatical hatred of the South, will find themselves mistaken in their calculations,—marked by a great and sudden disaster, and we dare to say, that if they should defeat us, we shall have, at least, the consolation of knowing that they will be, hereafter, defeated in their own aspirations."

Mr. Hubbard.

The Governor of Louisiana, thus concludes his Message transmitting Mr. Hubbard's letters to the Legislature: "In connection with this subject, I have thought it not amiss to transmit for your consideration, two letters from a person claiming to be the agent for this city, under the signature of 'J. H. Hubbard,' and who has been endeavoring to get his letters to be deemed worthy of your notice, not with any design to give credit to his mission; but that they may possibly indicate the expediency of such further legislation, as may guard the State in future, from the intrusion of any such emissary. A. MOUTON.

MEXICO.—Later intelligence from Mexico has been received, by which it appears that the rumor of the defeat of Santa Anna by Paredes, is unfounded. Santa Anna has under his command an army of twelve thousand men.

From our Washington Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 25, 1845. The defaulting Clerk has been held to bail in the sum of \$45,000. I understand his political friends at a distance have sent in, already, the sum of \$50,000 towards making up the deficiency.

On Monday, the 20th, the Texas question begins to look very sectional. The Committee was addressed by Mr. Hammett, of Mississippi, whose speech amounted to Texas-re-annexation—re-annexation—disunion.

Mr. Hudson made a most argumentative disquisition on Anti-Slavery exposure. He was followed by little Marsh, of Vermont, who came thundering down on the South severely. He was followed by that strong Southern man, Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, in his most able style, in a speech on the constitutionality and expediency of Annexation. Under the former head, the ingenuity of an able lawyer, was vainly displayed, and under the latter, the eloquence of an expert beggar was patriotically arrayed.

Mr. Giddings made one of his plain anti-slavery speeches, in which he said he had been expelled from the House for introducing the subject of Slavery into it, and now that it was agitated by Southern men, he hoped he would be permitted to express his views, and he was not about to propose that they should be expelled. Mr. G. spoke of the lash, of chains, and Slavery; cited awful scenes which have occurred in the city under his eye, spoke of the little here, from whence ascends daily, the clank of chains, and the groans of a downtrodden race. And, asked Mr. G., "Will Annexation put an end to all this?"

Each speech occupies an hour, to which they are limited. The House meets now at 11, and the debate on Texas is to end on Saturday, the 25th, at 2 o'clock. When a speaker concludes, some thirty members spring to the floor at the fall of the Chairman's hammer. It is indeed interesting to attend the debate, to see the spirit with which it is conducted, and to see them take new tracks. I will keep this letter open until its fate is decided.

Mr. Rathbun, a Democrat, from New-York, next addressed the Committee against Texas, Slavery, and the assumption by the House, of powers not delegated to them, as well as against setting themselves up as a court of appeals, to reverse the decision of the Senate, to whom, and the President alone, belonged the treaty-making power. And this would be a treaty to all intents and purposes. He was out upon the whole scheme. Southern men had said here, that the Governor of New-York was trembling on his throne, in view of his vote against Annexation in the Senate. Let him say to them that Mr. Wright stands too high for their meagre arrows. He is deeply seated in the hearts of his countrymen, and he is elected Governor by an anti-Texas vote of ten thousand majority. If the Texas question had been before the people of New-York, in the last election, it could not have mustered a corporal's guard. "Wright is never wrong."

A fierce debate sprung up to day, in the morning hour. Mr. Robinson, of New-York, introduced a bill for the Annexation of Texas, free free. A motion was immediately made to reject the bill. They were thrown into confusion, but finally the bill was received and referred to the Committee of the Whole, as the rest had been. But it gave opportunity for some of the opponents of

Annexation, to express their most bitter opposition. Andrew Stewart, of Pennsylvania, said a Southern man by the old compromise, who had five hundred slaves, had as many votes as three hundred of the intelligent freemen of the North. He was bound to abide by this as long as the Constitution remained unaltered, but the proposition to extend such a compromise over foreign territory, and bring it into this Union! it was impudence. Also, in this morning hour, were presented by Mr. Tilden, of Ohio, as well as by Mr. Allen in the Senate, those powerful resolutions of the Ohio Legislature, against the Annexation of Texas to the United States. They were read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

To-day the Committee was addressed also by Mr. Cobb, Democrat, from Georgia, in favor of the resolutions. He declared it was *unpardonable* for the gentleman from New-York, to offer a proposition to fix a free State in amongst them.

Mr. Pollock, of Pennsylvania, Whig, spoke against the resolutions.

Mr. Haralson, Democrat, from Georgia, spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Collamer, Whig, from Vermont, against the bill.

Mr. Seymour, Democrat, of New-York, expressed his desire for Annexation, but was opposed to the expedients proposed for affecting it.

Mr. Hamlin, Democrat, from Maine, opposed it, unless it was so done, that the North, as well as the South, should be satisfied.

On the 24th, Mr. Dromgoole spoke in favor of the bill, and Mr. Barnard, of New-York, and Mr. Adams, of Massachusetts, powerfully against it. Whilst Mr. A. was speaking, the members from all parts of the House drew near, and listened to him with the most marked attention. He came in at a good time to the rescue, and knocked under them many of the props on which they had built. I have not room for my notes of his speech to-day.

O. I. C. U.

P. S. Half-past four, the final vote on the Texas question, was this morning taken, and the result—yeas 120, nays 98.

It was amended so as to admit free territory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For the Standard—from Dec. 29, 1844, to Jan. 18, 1845.

Peter Wilson, New-York,	50
Nancy Baker, Bridgewater, N. Y.	2 00
Caleb Kelton, Coventry, R. I.	4 00
Godfrey Wheeler, Attleboro, Mass.	1 00
Hannah B. Shove, Providence, R. I.	25
William Davis, " "	3 00
Thomas Davis, " "	2 25
Henry A. Heyland, " "	1 50
Elmer M. Aldrich, " "	1 50
Francis Apple, " "	1 50
Wm. H. Anthony, " "	1 50
John H. Clark, " "	1 50
Hannah B. Shove, " "	1 50
E. K. Rathbone, " "	1 50
Alphonso R. James, " "	75
Nicholas G. Potter, " "	3 00
E. O. Warren, " "	2 37
Cyrus P. Bowen, " "	87
Alexander Burgess, " "	1 50
John Stokes, " "	1 37

